

Chairperson: Bob Wyatt, NW Natural
Treasurer: Frederick Wolf, DBA, Legacy Site Services for Arkema

June 19, 2014

Kristine Koch U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10 1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, M/S ECL-115 Seattle, Washington 98101-3140

Re: LWG Comments on Revised FS Section 2 (Lower Willamette River, Portland Harbor Superfund Site, USEPA Docket No: CERCLA-10-2001-0240)

Dear Ms. Koch:

The Lower Willamette Group (LWG) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have committed to a process to work together to finalize each section of the revised Feasibility Study (FS). This submittal addresses those portions of Section 2 of the FS for which EPA has indicated discussions have concluded and on which it is commencing to draft the revised text.

In the course of our discussions, we have identified several issues where we believe it will be useful for EPA to have a written explanation of the LWG's technical positions and the reasons behind those positions for EPA to consider as EPA revises Section 2. What follows is a summary of the LWG issues and themes identified in the three attachments to this letter:

- Contaminants of concern (COCs) and preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) should only be selected for those contaminants and exposure scenarios identified as posing unacceptable risk in the approved baseline human health and ecological risk assessments. The FS should focus on PRGs for which acceptable risk levels can be achieved through a sediment-only cleanup (Attachment 1).
- Development and use of sediment background concentrations in the FS should be consistent with the conceptual site model for the Site based on the data collected (Attachments 2 and 3).
- Risk-based PRGs should be consistent with the spatial scales of the exposure scenarios used to characterize risk in the approved baseline human health and ecological risk assessments for evaluating cleanup alternatives. Risk-based PRGs should also be developed based on technically sound principles and application of risk management principles, as called for in the regulation and guidance (Attachments 1 and 3).

The LWG has focused this letter and attachments on specific technical issues, many of which fall under our overarching concern about the delay in applying risk management principles in order

421 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 750, Portland, Oregon 97204

to establish the FS alternatives and assess them against the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act balancing criteria.

This input is part of the LWG's and EPA's efforts to reach consensus and develop a technically sound revised FS. It also is part of the continuing non-binding technical discussions that the parties agreed would precede EPA's revisions to each section. The LWG is also providing this input to continue our ongoing informal exchange of ideas and information. The comments provided herein, while certainly addressing many of the most important issues that have become apparent from the LWG's discussions with EPA, may not be our comprehensive list to be raised in either informal or formal dispute, given that EPA is currently revising Section 2.

We sincerely hope this information will be valuable to EPA as it undertakes the process of revising Section 2. We and our consultants remain available to discuss with EPA any issue we have raised here.

Sincerely,

Bob Wyatt

cc: Sean Sheldrake, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon
Nez Perce Tribe
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife
United States Fish & Wildlife
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
LWG Legal
LWG Repository